REMARKS

Claims 1-5 remain pending. In the Office Action dated June 25, 2007, Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Madden, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,285) in view of Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,260). The specification also stands objected to for including details described in the specification having no correlation to the drawings. No new matter is being introduced by way of the amendments.

Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

With regard to the objection of the specification and drawings, Applicant has amended the specification and amended the drawings with changes shown in red to address issues with correlation between the specification and drawings. More specifically, Applicant has amended FIG. 1 to show an exemplary user command input interface 14 (e.g., computer mouse). Support for the amendment is provided in originally filed paragraph 0069 ("[a]ssuming for this example that the user command input interface of the processor resource 10 is a mouse"). In addition, Applicant has amended FIG. 1 to show exemplary anaglyph viewing glasses 24 (paragraph [0058]) and synchronized shutter goggles 26 (paragraph [0059]).

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

With regard to the rejection of claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 is directed to a method for converting a two-dimensional image to a three dimensional image for display through a micro optical medium. In converting the image, "a user entered depth command assigning a first depth value to a portion of said depth map corresponding to a first area" is entered and "a second depth value [is assigned] to a portion of said depth map not corresponding to said first area."

Madden, by contrast, describes a technique for displaying a visual representation of an estimated three-dimensional scene structure and the values of various parameters associated with the scene. (Abstract) Madden uses automated image processing algorithms for generating initial depth maps from captured images. (col. 5, lines 46-53). The initial depth maps contain information derived from captured image sources and derived from camera data capture, manual data entry, and other secondary sensors. (col. 5, lines 48-56). In refining the depth maps, the user provides inputs, where the user inputs include "information to the system identifying elements or regions in the

image as being *straight lines, planes, circles, and other geometric abstractions or pixel regions*." (emphasis added) (col. 6, lines 1-3) The user-entered information that identifies elements or regions is not the same or analogous to a "user-entered depth command *assigning a first depth value* to a portion of said depth map corresponding to a first area." (emphasis added). In other words, defining types of image elements is not the same as a user-entered depth command that assigns a first depth value. Furthermore, although Madden describes that the user provides input in the form of parametric adjustments, such as focal length, the physical distance between two points in the scene, camera position in time, camera shutter speed, and camera aperture settings (col. 6, lines 23-40), these parametric adjustments are a second scenario (col. 6, line 23) and do not equate to "assigning a second depth value to a portion of said depth map not corresponding to said first area," as recited in Applicant's claimed invention.

In addition to Madden not teaching or suggesting the "receiving" and "assigning" elements of claim 1 as described above, Applicant respectfully rejects that information derived from the "automated scene process" of Madden is the same or equivalent to "a user-entered depth command assigning a first depth value." Madden's depth values are not derived in the same or similar manner as claimed by Applicant.

Robinson describes a method for creating a 2½D solid model picture from a 3D image in which a stereoscopic image is identified as a series of depth slices and the resulting slice data is built up to a 2½D model. The process described in Robinson is opposite that of Applicant's claimed invention, which generates a 3D image from a 2D image. More particularly, Robinson teaches "[a]n advantage of the invention is that despite *starting with a stereoscopic image* rather than a multiple slice image, a reconstruction can still be made automatically in software to provide a 2½D display with all its current features. The net result will be both a full binocular stereoscopic image (3D) and also a 2½D solid model reconstruction derived from it [(i.e., the 3D image)]." (col. 4, lines 7-12) In other words, Robinson teaches generating a 2½D image from a 3D image, which is opposite to what Applicant's claimed invention does.

As cited in the Office Action, Robinson describes using an anaglyph technique, whereby lateral shifting would take place. This lateral shifting, however, appears to be used for generating a 2½D image. Applicant respectfully submits that the invention, as claimed, uses the user-entered first depth value and the second depth value in performing the shifting to generate a parallax image for creating a 3D image. As previously described, Madden does not teach or suggest a user-entered

first depth value and second depth value as claimed. Because Madden does not teach or suggest two of Applicant's claim elements and Robinson teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention, the combination of Madden and Robinson at a minimum cannot teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention and, more likely, teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn. Claims 2-4, which depend from independent claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 5 includes analogous claim elements as claim 1 and, thus, should be allowable over Madden and Robinson for at least the same reasons as described above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0709, under Order No. 011908.0124PTUS from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 12/17/07

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Joseph V. Colaianni
Registration No.: 20,019
PATTON BOGGS LLP
2550 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
Telephone - 202-457-6000
Facsimile - 202-457-6315
Attorney for Applicant